Recursive nonlinear-system identification using latent variables

Per Mattsson, Dave Zachariah, Petre Stoica

arXiv:1606.04366v1 [stat.ML] 14 Jun 2016

***Abstract*—In this paper we develop a method for learning nonlinear systems with multiple outputs and inputs. We begin by modelling the errors of a nominal predictor of the system using a latent variable framework. Then using the maximum likelihood principle we derive a criterion for learning the model. The resulting optimization problem is tackled using a majorization-minimization approach. Finally, we develop a convex majorization technique and show that it enables a recursive identification method. The method learns parsimonious predictive models and is tested on both synthetic and real nonlinear systems.**

I. Introduction

In this paper we consider the problem of learning a nonlinear dynamical system with multiple inputs $\mathbf{y}(t)$ and multiple outputs $\mathbf{u}(t)$. Generally this identification, or learning, problem can be tackled using different model structures, with the class of linear models being arguably the most well studied in engineering, statistics and econometrics [1]–[5].

Linear models are often used even when the system is known to be nonlinear [6]. However certain nonlinearities, such as saturations, cannot always be neglected. In such cases using block-oriented models is a popular approach to capture static nonlinearities [7]. To model nonlinear dynamics a common approach is to use NARMAX models [8].

In this paper we are interested in recursive identification methods [9]. In cases where the model structure is linear in the parameters, recursive least-squares can be applied. For certain models with nonlinear parameters, the extended recursive least-squares has been used [10]. Another popular approach is the recursive prediction error method which has been developed, e.g., for Wiener models, Hammerstein models, and polynomial state-space models [11]–[13].

Nonparametric models are often based on weighted sums of the observed data [14]. The weights vary for each predicted output and the number of weights increases with each observed datapoint. The weights are typically obtained in a batch manner; in [15], [16] they are computed recursively but must be recomputed for each new prediction of the output.

In this paper, we start from a nominal predictor model structure using basic insights of a system: E.g. for many nonlinear systems, linear models work well around an operating point and can therefore be used as a nominal predictor model. The strategy in [17] exploits this fact by first finding the best linear approximation using a frequency domain approach. Then, starting from this approximation, a nonlinear polynomial state-space model is fitted by solving a nonconvex problem. This two-step method cannot be readily implemented recursively and it requires input signals with appropriate frequency domain properties.

The accuracy of the nominal predictor can be assessed using the prediction errors [18]. Here we characterize the nominal prediction errors using a flexible latent variable model. By jointly estimating the nominal model parameters and the latent variables, we develop a refined predictor. The general model structure and problem formulation are introduced in Section II. Then in Section III we apply the principle of maximum likelihood to derive a statistically motivated learning criterion. In Section IV this nonconvex criterion is minimized using a majorization-minimization approach that gives rise to a convex user-parameter free method. We derive a computionally efficient recursive algorithm for solving the convex problem, which can be applied to large datasets as well as online learning scenarios. The method learns parsimonious predictor models that capture nonlinear system dynamics. In Section V, we evaluate the proposed method using both synthetic and real data examples.

Notation: $\mathbf{E}_{i,j}$ denotes the ijth standard basis matrix. $\otimes$ and $\odot$ denote the Kronecker and Hadamard products, respectively. $\mathrm{vec}(\cdot)$ is the vectorization operation. $\|\mathbf{x}\|_2$, $\|\mathbf{x}\|_1$ and $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\mathbf{W}} = \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{W}\mathbf{X}\}}$, where $\mathbf{W} \succ \mathbf{0}$, denote ℓ_2-, ℓ_1- and weighted norms, respectively. The Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of $\mathbf{X}$ is denoted $\mathbf{X}^\dagger$.

Remark 1. An implementation of the proposed method is available at http://www.it.uu.se/katalog/davza513.

II. Problem formulation

Let $\mathbf{y}(t)$ denote the output of a system and let $\mathbf{u}(t)$ be its exogenous variables or inputs (when they exist). Let a finite data record of the system be denoted

$$\mathcal{D}_t \triangleq \{(\mathbf{y}(1), \mathbf{u}(1)), \ldots, (\mathbf{y}(t), \mathbf{u}(t))\}. \tag{1}$$

The output of a general system with n_y outputs can be written as

$$\mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{y}_0(t) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_0(t)$ is any one-step-ahead predictor based on $\mathcal{D}_{t-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t) = \mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{y}_0(t)$ is the prediction error. Here we use the following nominal predictor model,

$$\mathbf{y}_0(t) = \boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t), \tag{3}$$

where the $p \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$ is a given function of $\mathcal{D}_{t-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ denotes the unknown parameters. The structure can be based on basic insights of the system, such as linear dynamics around an operating point or other physical principles, as discussed below.

This work has been partly supported by the Swedish Research Council (VR) under contract 621-2014-5874.

The popular ARX model structure, for instance, can be cast into the framework (2) and (3) by assuming that the nominal prediction error $\varepsilon(t)$ is a white noise process [1], [2]. For real world systems this assumption is virtually never satisfied. However, as long as (3) accurately describes the dynamics of the system around its operation point, this assumption can still be a good approximation of reality. Here we are interested in cases where this may not be true, which can include systems with even weak nonlinearities [6].

In this paper we use the following model of $\varepsilon(t)$ conditioned on the past data $\mathcal{D}_{t-1}$,

$$\varepsilon(t)|\mathcal{D}_{t-1}, \mathbf{Z} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times q}$ is a matrix of unknown latent variables, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is an unknown covariance matrix, and the $q \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ is any given function of $\mathcal{D}_{t-1}$. This is a fairly general model structure that can capture correlated data-dependent nominal prediction errors, which arise e.g. from system nonlinearities. Note that when $\mathbf{Z}$ is zero, we obtain the nominal model.

Prior to data collection, the latent variable $\mathbf{Z}$ is modeled as a random variable

$$\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{Z}) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{D}), \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{D}$ is an unknown covariance matrix. This formulation enables us to use overparameterized error models (4) with a large q, in which case a sparse $\mathbf{Z}$ is desirable.

Our goal is to identify a refined predictor of the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}(t) = \underbrace{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}}_0(t)} + \underbrace{\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(t)}, \tag{6}$$

from a data set $\mathcal{D}_{t-1}$, by maximizing the likelihood function. The first term is an estimate of the nominal predictor model while the second term tries to capture structure in the data that is not taken into account by the nominal model. Note that when $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$ is sparse we obtain a parsimonious predictor model.

Remark 2. A typical example of $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$ is

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t) = [\mathbf{y}^\top(t-1) \cdots \mathbf{y}^\top(t-n_a)\ \mathbf{u}^\top(t-1) \cdots \mathbf{u}^\top(t-n_b)\ 1]^\top, \tag{7}$$

in which case the nominal predictor is linear in the data and therefore captures the linear system dynamics. Additional physical principles can be incorporated if such are known about the system, in which case $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$ can be nonlinear in the data.

Remark 3. The nonlinear function $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ of $\mathcal{D}_{t-1}$ can be seen as a basis expansion and can be chosen to yield a flexible model structure of the errors. In the examples below we will use the Laplace operator basis functions [19]. Other possible choices include the polynomial basis functions, Fourier basis functions, wavelets, etc. [2], [8], [20].

Remark 4. In (6), $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(t)$ is a one-step-ahead predictor. However, the framework can be readily applied to k-step-ahead prediction where $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ depend on $\mathbf{y}(1), \ldots, \mathbf{y}(t-k)$.

III. Latent variable framework

For notational simplicity, we define a record of N samples

$$\mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{y}(1) & \cdots & \mathbf{y}(N)\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times N}.$$

In Section III-A, we derive the likelihood function $p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and formulate a maximum likelihood estimate of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$. Subsequently, in Section III-B, we discuss the estimation of the latent variable $\mathbf{Z}$, and in Section III-C we show how all unknown parameters can be estimated jointly. The estimates $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$ are used in (6). In Section IV we tackle the corresponding optimization problem using a majorization-minimization approach.

A. Maximum marginal likelihood

Let $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \{\boldsymbol{\Theta}, \mathbf{D}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\}$ denote the unknown parameters in the likelihood function. In order to estimate the parameters of the nominal predictor, we will maximize the likelihood function

$$p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega}) = \int p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \mathbf{Z}) p(\mathbf{Z}) d\mathbf{Z}. \tag{8}$$

In (8) the latent variable has been marginalized out.

The function $p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \mathbf{Z})$ can be found from (2) and (4) using the chain rule:

$$p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \mathbf{Z}) = \prod_{t=1}^{N} p_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\mathbf{y}(t) - \boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)|\mathcal{D}_{t-1}, \mathbf{Z}), \tag{9}$$

where we have neglected the effect of initial conditions [1]. Since

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\mathbf{y}(t) - \boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)|\mathcal{D}_{t-1}, \mathbf{Z}) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y}(t) - \boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t) - \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)\|^2_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}}\right),$$

it follows that

$$p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \mathbf{Z}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{n_y N}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^N}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\Phi} - \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}}\right), \tag{10}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi} = \begin{bmatrix}\boldsymbol{\varphi}(1) & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\varphi}(N)\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times N}$$
$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix}\boldsymbol{\gamma}(1) & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\gamma}(N)\end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times N}.$$

The integral in (8) can therefore be computed using (10) and (5). In order to simplify the derivation, we introduce the vectorized variables

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{Y}), \quad \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}), \quad \mathbf{z} = \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{Z}),$$

and

$$\mathbf{F} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n_y}, \quad \mathbf{G} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n_y}.$$

Then we have the following identities

$$\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\Phi}) = \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}) = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{z}.$$

and, furthermore,

$$\|\mathbf{Y} - \boldsymbol{\Theta}\boldsymbol{\Phi} - \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}} = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{G}\mathbf{z}\|^2_{\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}}.$$

As shown in Appendix A, after inserting (10) into (8) we obtain

$$p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{Nn_y}|\mathbf{R}|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}}\right), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\mathbf{R} \triangleq \mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^\top + \mathbf{I}_N \otimes \mathbf{\Sigma} \quad (12)$$

is an $n_yN \times n_yN$ matrix. Note that (11) is not a Gaussian distribution in general, since $\mathbf{G}$ may be a function of $\mathbf{Y}$. It can be verified that maximizing (11) is equivalent to solving

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Omega}} \; V(\mathbf{\Omega}), \quad (13)$$

where

$$V(\mathbf{\Omega}) \triangleq \|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}} + \ln|\mathbf{R}|$$

and $\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta} = \operatorname{vec}(\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Phi}) = \operatorname{vec}([\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(1) \; \cdots \; \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(N)])$ is nothing but the vector of nominal prediction errors. From (13) we can estimate the parameter matrix $\mathbf{\Theta}$ and the covariance parameters in $\mathbf{D}$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}$.

B. Latent variable estimation

Next, we turn to the latent variable $\mathbf{Z}$ which is used to model the nominal prediction error $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(t)$ in (4). The conditional distribution of $\mathbf{Z}$ can be written as

$$p(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{\Omega},\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{\Omega},\mathbf{Z})p(\mathbf{Z})}{p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{\Omega})} \quad (14)$$

The quantities in the right-hand side of (14) are given in (5), (9) and (11). After inserting these expressions in (14) we obtain, as shown in Appendix A, a Gaussian distribution

$$p(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{\Omega},\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{n_yq}|\mathbf{\Sigma}_z|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{z}-\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2_{\mathbf{\Sigma}_z^{-1}}\right), \quad (15)$$

with conditional mean

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^\top\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (16)$$

and covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_z = \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1} + \mathbf{G}^\top(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1})\mathbf{G}\right)^{-1}. \quad (17)$$

An estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$ is then given by evaluating the conditional mean of $\mathbf{Z}$ in (16) at the optimal estimates $\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$ obtained via (13).

C. Summary

In summary, we obtain $\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$ via (13) and (16) for use in (6). We now show that these two estimates can be obtained jointly using a concise formulation (see Theorem 2).

Lemma 1. *The following equality holds*

$$\|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}} = \|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}-\mathbf{G}\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2_{\mathbf{I}\otimes\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}} + \|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2_{\mathbf{D}^{-1}}.$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ∎

Theorem 2. *The optimization problem*

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{D},\mathbf{\Sigma}} \; \|\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Phi}-\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|^2_{\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}} + \|\operatorname{vec}(\mathbf{Z})\|^2_{\mathbf{D}^{-1}} + \ln|\mathbf{R}| \quad (18)$$

attains its optimal value for the $\mathbf{\Theta}, \mathbf{D}, \mathbf{\Sigma}$ that minimizes $V(\mathbf{\Omega})$ in (13)*, and the minimizing $\mathbf{Z}$ is given by the conditional mean in* (16)*.*

Proof: First note that after vectorization

$$\|\mathbf{Y}-\mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Phi}-\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|^2_{\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}} = \|\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}-\mathbf{G}\operatorname{vec}(\mathbf{Z})\|^2_{\mathbf{I}\otimes\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}}.$$

The matrix $\mathbf{Z}$ minimizing (18) is thus given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{vec}(\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}) &= \left(\mathbf{G}^\top(\mathbf{I}_N\otimes\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1})\mathbf{G} + \mathbf{D}^{-1}\right)^{-1} \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{G}^\top(\mathbf{I}_N\otimes\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^\top\mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\zeta}.\end{aligned}$$

Concentrating out $\mathbf{Z}$ from (18) and using Lemma 1 yields (13). ∎

This approach to the learning of dynamical system models is based on *la*tent *va*riables and designated using the acronym LAVA. The nonconvex problem in (18) can be tackled using efficient iterative search methods, e.g. based on the majorization-minimization approach [21] which we present next.

IV. Majorization-minimization approach

The majorization-minimization approach to solve (13) is based on using a majorizing function $V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}})$ at any given point $\widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}$:

$$V(\mathbf{\Omega}) \le V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}), \quad \forall\mathbf{\Omega} \quad (19)$$

with equality when $\mathbf{\Omega} = \widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}$. The key is to find a majorizing function that is simpler to minimize than $V(\mathbf{\Omega})$. Let $\mathbf{\Omega}_{n+1}$ denote the minimizer of $V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\mathbf{\Omega}_n)$. Then it follows that

$$V(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n+1}) \le V'(\mathbf{\Omega}_{n+1}|\mathbf{\Omega}_n) \le V'(\mathbf{\Omega}_n|\mathbf{\Omega}_n) = V(\mathbf{\Omega}_n). \quad (20)$$

This property leads directly to an iterative scheme that decreases $V(\mathbf{\Omega})$ monotonically, starting from an initial estimate $\mathbf{\Omega}_0$. In general, $V(\mathbf{\Omega})$ may have local minima, and the obtained estimates will depend on the choice of $\mathbf{\Omega}_0$. Given the overparameterized error model (4), a natural choice is points in the parameter space which correspond to the nominal predictor model structure. That is, $\mathbf{\Omega}_0 = \{\mathbf{\Theta}_0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_0\}$. Note that solutions at which certain diagonal elements of $\mathbf{D}$ are zero correspond to sparse $\mathbf{Z}$ matrices and therefore to parsimonious predictor models (6).

Below we derive a convex majorizing function which promotes parsimonious predictor models and is amenable to a recursive formulation, which is of interest in this paper.

A. Convex majorization

For a parsimonious parameterization and computationally advantageous formulation, we consider a diagonal structure of the covariance matrices in (4), i.e.,

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \operatorname{diag}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_{n_y}). \quad (21)$$

and let $\mathbf{D}_i = \operatorname{diag}(d_{i,1}, \ldots, d_{i,q})$ denote the covariance matrix corresponding to the ith row of $\mathbf{Z}$, so that

$$\mathbf{D} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \mathbf{D}_i \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i}. \quad (22)$$

We begin by majorizing (13) with respect to the concave term $\ln|\mathbf{R}|$:

$$\ln|\mathbf{R}| \leq \ln|\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}| - \mathrm{tr}\{\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}})\} - \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{G}^\top\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}\} + \mathrm{tr}\{\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \mathbf{\Sigma})\} + \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{G}^\top\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\}, \tag{23}$$

where $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ are arbitrary diagonal covariance matrices and $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}$ is obtained by inserting $\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ into (12). The right-hand side of the inequality above is a majorizing tangent plane to $\ln|\mathbf{R}|$, cf. Appendix B. The use of (23) yields a convex majorizing function of $V(\mathbf{\Omega})$ in (13):

$$V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}) = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}} + \mathrm{tr}\{\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \mathbf{\Sigma})\} + \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{G}^\top\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\} + \widetilde{K}, \tag{24}$$

where $\widetilde{K} = \ln|\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}| - \mathrm{tr}\{\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}})\} - \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{G}^\top\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}\}$ is a constant. Note that (24) is invariant with respect to $\widetilde{\mathbf{\Theta}}$.

Theorem 3. *The majorizing function* (24) *can also be written as*

$$V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}) = \min_{\mathbf{Z}} \; V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\mathbf{Z}, \widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}) \tag{25}$$

where

$$V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\mathbf{Z}, \widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}) = \|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{\Theta}\mathbf{\Phi} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|^2_{\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}} + \|\,\mathrm{vec}(\mathbf{Z})\|^2_{\mathbf{D}^{-1}} + \mathrm{tr}\{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \mathbf{\Sigma})\} + \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{G}^\top\tilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\} + \widetilde{K}. \tag{26}$$

The minimizing $\mathbf{Z}$ *is given by the conditional mean in* (16)*.*

Proof: The problem in (25) has a minimizing $\mathbf{Z}$ which, after vectorization, equals $\boldsymbol{\zeta}$ in (16) (see Theorem 2). Inserting the minimizing $\mathbf{Z}$ into (26) and using Lemma 1 yields (24). ∎

To prepare for the minimization of the function (26) we write the matrix quantities using variables that denote the ith rows of the following matrices:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}_i^\top \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{\Theta} = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_i^\top \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots \\ \mathbf{z}_i^\top \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{\Gamma} = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots \\ \overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i^\top \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

Theorem 4. *The minimizing arguments* $\mathbf{\Theta}$ *and* $\mathbf{Z}$ *of the function* (26) *are obtained by solving the following convex problem:*

$$\min_{\mathbf{\Theta},\mathbf{Z}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \Big(\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top\mathbf{z}_i\|_2 + \|\mathbf{w}_i \odot \mathbf{z}_i\|_1 \Big) \tag{27}$$

where

$$\mathbf{w}_i = \begin{bmatrix} w_{i,1} & \cdots & w_{i,q} \end{bmatrix}^\top \tag{28}$$

$$w_{i,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j}{\mathrm{tr}\{\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\}}} \tag{29}$$

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i = \mathbf{\Gamma}\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}_i\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top + \widetilde{\sigma}_i\mathbf{I}_N. \tag{30}$$

The minimizing covariance parameters (21) *and* (22) *are given by*

$$\hat{\sigma}_i = \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top\mathbf{z}_i\|_2}{\sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\{\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\}}}$$

$$\hat{d}_{i,j} = \frac{|z_{i,j}|}{\sqrt{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j}}$$

Proof: See Appendix C. ∎

Remark 5. The problem in (27) is separable in the sense that each term of the sum can be optimized independently. Note that minimizing each term of (27) is equivalent to solving a weighted square-root LASSO problem, cf. [22], [23].

Remark 6. Majorizing at a nominal predictor model, i.e. $\widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}} = \{\widetilde{\mathbf{\Theta}}, \mathbf{0}, \widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\}$ as discussed above, yields $\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i = \widetilde{\sigma}_i\mathbf{I}_N$ and the weights are given by

$$w_{i,j} = \frac{\|\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j\|_2}{\sqrt{N}}. \tag{31}$$

Then problem (27) and consequently the minimization of (25) becomes invariant with respect to $\widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}$.

Theorem 5. *Initializing the iterative scheme* (20) *at any point* $\mathbf{\Omega}_0 = \{\mathbf{\Theta}_0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_0\}$ *with* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0 \succ \mathbf{0}$ *will result in the same minimizing sequence* $(\mathbf{\Theta}_n, \mathbf{Z}_n)$*, for all* $n > 0$*. As* $n \to \infty$*, the minimizing sequence* $(\mathbf{D}_n, \mathbf{\Sigma}_n)$ *converges to the same point irrespective of the choice of* $\mathbf{\Omega}_0 = \{\mathbf{\Theta}_0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_0\}$*.*

Proof: See Appendix D. ∎

Remark 7. As a result we may initialize the majorization-minimization scheme (20) at $\mathbf{\Omega}_0 = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{n_y}\}$. This obviates the need for carefully selecting an initialization point.

B. Recursive computation

The convex problem (27) can be solved recursively, for each new sample $\mathbf{y}(t)$ and $\mathbf{u}(t)$, using a fixed set of weights (28). Furthermore, for $\mathbf{\Omega}_0 = \{\mathbf{\Theta}_0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_0\}$, the weights (31) can be easily computed jointly in a recursive fashion.

1) Computing $\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}}$*:* If we fix $\mathbf{Z}$ and only solve for $\mathbf{\Theta}$, the solution is given by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}} = \overline{\mathbf{\Theta}} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{H}^\top \tag{32}$$

where

$$\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}} = \mathbf{Y}\mathbf{\Phi}^\dagger, \quad \mathbf{H}^\top = \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Phi}^\dagger.$$

Note that both $\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ are independent of $\mathbf{Z}$, and that they can be computed for each sample t using a standard recursive least-squares (LS) algorithm:

$$\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}(t) = \overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}(t-1) + (\mathbf{y}(t) - \overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}(t-1)\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t))\boldsymbol{\varphi}^\top(t)\mathbf{P}(t) \tag{33}$$

$$\mathbf{H}(t) = \mathbf{H}(t-1) + \mathbf{P}(t)\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top(t) - \boldsymbol{\varphi}^\top(t)\mathbf{H}(t-1)) \tag{34}$$

$$\mathbf{P}(t) = \mathbf{P}(t-1) - \frac{\mathbf{P}(t-1)\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)\boldsymbol{\varphi}^\top(t)\mathbf{P}(t-1)}{1 + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^\top(t)\mathbf{P}(t-1)\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)}. \tag{35}$$

Remark 8. Natural initial values are $\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}(0) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{H}(0) = \mathbf{0}$. The matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}^\dagger$ equals $\mathbf{\Phi}^\top(\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{\Phi}^\top)^{-1}$ when $t \geq p$ samples yield a full-rank matrix $\mathbf{\Phi}$. The matrix $\mathbf{P}(t)$ converges to $(\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{\Phi}^\top)^{-1}$.

A common choice for the initial value of $\mathbf{P}(t)$ is $\mathbf{P}(0) = c\mathbf{I}$, where a larger constant $c > 0$ leads to a faster convergence of (35), cf. [1], [24].

2) Computing $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$: Using (32), we concentrate out $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ from (27) to obtain the criterion

$$V'(\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i - \left(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}^\top - \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \mathbf{H}\right) \mathbf{z}_i\|_2 + \|\mathbf{w}_i \odot \mathbf{z}_i\|_1 \right)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = \mathbf{y}_i - \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\top \overline{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i.$$

In Appendix E it is shown how the minimum of $V'(\mathbf{Z})$ can be found via cyclic minimization with respect to the elements of $\mathbf{Z}$, similar to what has been done in [25] in a simpler case. This iterative procedure is implemented using recursively computed quantities and produces an estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t)$ at sample t.

3) Summary of the algorithm: The algorithm computes $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(t)$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t)$ recursively by means of the following steps at each sample t:

i) Compute $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{H}(t)$, using (33)-(35).
ii) Compute $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t)$ via the cyclic minimization of $V'(\mathbf{Z})$. Cycle through all elements L times.
iii) Compute $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(t) = \overline{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(t) - \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(t)\mathbf{H}^\top(t)$

The estimates are initialized as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(0) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}(0) = \mathbf{0}$. The computational details are given in Algorithm 1 in Appendix E, which can be readily implemented e.g. in MATLAB.

V. Numerical experiments

In this section we evaluate the proposed method and compare it with two alternative identification methods.

A. Identification methods and experiment setup

The numerical experiments were conducted as follows. Three methods have been used: LS identification of affine ARX, NARX using wavelet networks (WAVE for short), and LAVA using the algorithm in Section IV-B. From our numerical experiments we found that performing only one iteration of majorization-minimization algorithm produces good results and leads to a computationally efficient recursive implementation (which we denote LAVA-R for *r*ecursive).

For each method the function $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$ is taken as the linear regressor in (7). Then the dimension of $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$ equals $p = n_y n_a + n_u n_b + 1$. For affine ARX, the model is given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{ARX}(t) = \overline{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t),$$

where $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ is estimated using recursive least squares [1]. Note that in LAVA-R, $\overline{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ is computed as a byproduct via (33).

For the wavelet network, `nlarx` in the System Identification Toolbox for Matlab was used, with the number of nonlinear units automatically detected [26].

For LAVA-R, the model is given by (6) and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}, \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$ are found by the minimization of (27) using $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_0 = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{n_y}\}$. The nonlinear function $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ of the data $\mathcal{D}_{t-1}$ can be chosen to be a set of basis functions evaluated at $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$. Then $\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ can be seen as a truncated basis expansion of some nonlinear function. In the numerical examples, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$ uses the Laplace basis expansion [19] for which the elements are given by

$$\gamma_{k_1,\ldots,k_{p-1}}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_i}} \sin\left(\frac{\pi k_i(\varphi_i(t) + \ell_i)}{2\ell_i}\right), \quad (36)$$

where ℓ_i are the boundaries of the inputs and outputs for each channel and $k_i = 1, \ldots, M$ are the indices for each element of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$. Then the dimension of

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t) = [\gamma_{1,\ldots,1}(t) \ \cdots \ \gamma_{p-1,\ldots,p-1}(t)]^\top$$

equals $q = M^{p-1}$, where M is a user parameter which determines the resolution of the basis.

Finally, an important part of the identification setup is the choice of input signal. For a nonlinear system it is important to excite the system both in frequency and in amplitude. For linear models a commonly used input signal is a pseudorandom binary sequence (PRBS), which is a signal that shifts between two levels in a certain fashion. One reason for using PRBS is that it has good correlation properties [1]. Hence, PRBS excites the system well in frequency, but poorly in amplitude. A remedy to the poor amplitude excitation is to multiply each interval of constant signal level with a random factor that is uniformly distributed on some interval $[0, A]$, cf. [27]. Hence, if the PRBS takes the values -1 and 1, then the resulting sequence will contain constant intervals with random amplitudes between $-A$ and A. We denote such a random amplitude sequence RS(A) where A is the maximum amplitude.

B. Performance metric

For the examples considered here the system does not necessarily belong to the model class, and thus there is no true parameter vector to compare with the estimated parameters. Hence, the different methods will instead be evaluated with respect to the simulated model output $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_s(t)$. For LAVA-R

$$\hat{\mathbf{y}}_s(t) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(t) + \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(t)$$

where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(t) = [\hat{\mathbf{y}}_s^\top(t-1) \cdots \hat{\mathbf{y}}_s^\top(t-n_a) \ \mathbf{u}^\top(t-1) \cdots \mathbf{u}^\top(t-n_b) \ 1]^\top.$$

and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(t)$ is computed as in (36) but with $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$ replaced by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(t)$.

The performance can then be evaluated using the root mean squared error (RMSE) for each output channel i,

$$\text{RMSE}_i = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathrm{E}\left[\|y_i(t) - \hat{y}_{s,i}(t)\|_2^2\right]}.$$

The expectations are computed using 100 Monte Carlo simulations.

For the dataset collected from a real system, it is not possible to evaluate the expectation in the RMSE formula. For such sets we use the fit of the data as a performance metric, i.e.,

$$\text{FIT}_i = 100\left(1 - \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_i - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{s,i}\|_2}{\|\mathbf{y}_i - \bar{y}_i\mathbf{1}\|_2}\right),$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_{s,i}$ contains the simulated outputs for channel i, $\bar{y}_i$ is the empirical mean of $\mathbf{y}_i$ and $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of ones. Hence, FIT compares the simulated output errors with those obtained using the empirical mean as the model output.

C. System with saturation

Consider the following state-space model,

$$x_1(t+1) = \text{sat}_2[0.9x_1(t) + 0.1u_1(t)] \quad (37)$$
$$x_2(t+1) = 0.08x_1(t) + 0.9x_2(t) + 0.6u_2(t) \quad (38)$$
$$\mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{e}(t). \quad (39)$$

where $\mathbf{x}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1(t) & x_2(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top$ and

$$\text{sat}_a(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x| < a \\ \text{sign}(x)a & \text{if } |x| \geq a \end{cases}.$$

A block-diagram for the above system is shown in Fig. 1. The measurement noise $\mathbf{e}(t)$ was chosen as a white Gaussian process with covariance matrix $\sigma\mathbf{I}$ where $\sigma = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-3}$.

Data was collected from the system using an RS(A) input signal for several different amplitudes A. The identification was performed using $n_a = 1$, $n_b = 1$, $M = 4$, and $N = 1000$ data samples. This means that $p = 5$ and $q = 256$, and therefore there are 10 parameters in $\mathbf{\Theta}$ and 512 in $\mathbf{Z}$.



Fig. 1. A block diagram of the system used in Example V-C.

Note that, for sufficiently low amplitudes A, $x_1(t)$ will be smaller than the saturation level $a = 2$ for all t, and thus the system will behave as a linear system. However, when A increases, the saturation will affect the system output more and more. The RMSE was computed for eight different amplitudes A, and the result is shown in Fig. 2. It can be seen that for small amplitudes, when the system is effectively linear, the ARX model gives a marginally better result than LAVA-R and WAVE. However, as the amplitude is increased, the nonlinear effects become more important, and LAVA-R outperforms both WAVE and ARX models.

D. Water tank

In this example a real cascade tank process is studied. It consists of two tanks mounted on top of each other, with free outlets. The top tank is fed with water by a pump. The input signal is the voltage applied to the pump, and the output consists of the water level in the two tanks. The setup is described in more detail in [27]. The data set consists of 2500 samples collected every five seconds. The first 1250 samples



Fig. 2. The RMSE for Example (V-C) computed for different input amplitudes, using LAVA-R (solid), affine ARX (dashed) and WAVE (dash-dotted).



Fig. 3. The output in Example V-D (blue), plotted together with the output of the model identified by LAVA-R (red). The system was identified using the first 1250 data samples.

where used for identification, and the last 1250 samples for validation.

The identification was performed using $n_a = 2$, $n_b = 2$ and $M = 3$. With two outputs, this results in 14 parameters in $\mathbf{\Theta}$ and 1458 parameters in $\mathbf{Z}$. LAVA-R found a model with only 37 nonzero parameters in $\mathbf{Z}$, and the simulated output together with the measured output are shown in Fig. 3. The FIT values, computed on the validation data are shown in Table I. It can be seen that an affine ARX model gives a good fit, but also that using LAVA-R the FIT measure can be improved significantly. In this example, WAVE did not perform well.

TABLE I
FIT FOR EXAMPLE V-D.

	LAVA-R	WAVE	ARX
Upper tank	91.6%	79.2%	84.9%
Lower tank	90.8%	76.9%	78.6%

TABLE II
FIT FOR EXAMPLE V-E.

	LAVA-R	WAVE	ARX
FIT	83.2%	78.2%	73.1%

E. Pick-and-place machine

In the final example, a real pick-and-place machine is studied. This machine is used to place electronic components on a circuit board, and is described in detail in [28]. The machine can be in several different modes, with two major modes being the free mode and the impact mode. In the free mode, the machine is carrying an electronic component, but is not in contact with the circuit board. When the electronic component gets in contact with the circuit board the system switches to the impact mode. Besides these two modes, the system can also exhibit saturation and other nonlinearities. The data used here are from a real physical process, and were also used in e.g. [29]–[31]. The data set consists of a 15s recording of the single input $u(t)$ and the vertical position of the mounting head $y(t)$. The data was sampled at 50 Hz, and the first 8s were used for identifying the model and the last 7s for validation.

The identification was performed using $n_a = 2$, $n_b = 2$ and $M = 6$. For the SISO system considered here, this results in 5 parameters for $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and 1296 parameters for $\mathbf{Z}$. LAVA-R found a model with 33 of the parameters in $\mathbf{Z}$ being nonzero, the output of which is shown in Fig. 4.



Fig. 4. The output in Example V-E (blue), plotted together with the output of the model identified by LAVA-R (red).

The FIT values, computed on the validation data, for LAVA-R, WAVE and affine ARX are shown in Table II. LAVA-R outperforms NARX using wavelet networks, and both are better than ARX.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have developed a method for learning nonlinear systems with multiple outputs and inputs. We began by modelling the errors of a nominal predictor using a latent variable formulation. The nominal predictor model can be formulated using basic insights of a system, such as physical principles and/or the fact that linear models work well around an operating point. A learning criterion was derived based on the principle of maximum likelihood and minimized using a majorization-minimization approach. Specifically, we derived a convex user-parameter free formulation, which led to a computionally efficient recursive algorithm that can be applied to large datasets as well as online learning problems.

The method introduced in this paper learns parsimonious predictor models and captures the nonlinear system dynamics. This was illustrated via synthetic as well as real data examples. As shown in these examples a recursive implementation of the proposed method was capable of outperforming a batch method using a NARX model with a wavelet network.

APPENDIX A
DERIVATION OF THE DISTRIBUTIONS (11) AND (15)

We first note the following useful equality

$$\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{G}\mathbf{z}\|^2_{\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}} + \|\mathbf{z}\|^2_{\mathbf{D}^{-1}} = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}} + \|\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1}} \quad (40)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{R} &= \mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^\top + \mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z &= \left(\mathbf{D}^{-1} + \mathbf{G}^\top(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})\mathbf{G}\right)^{-1} \\ \boldsymbol{\zeta} &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z \mathbf{G}^\top (\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}) \\ &= \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}).\end{aligned}$$

This equality follows from expanding the norms on both sides of (40), and applying the matrix inversion lemma to see that

$$(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}) + \boldsymbol{\zeta}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta})^\top (\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

The sought-after distribution $p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega})$ is given by (8). By using (40) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \mathbf{Z})p(\mathbf{Z}) \propto \\ \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{G}\mathbf{z}\|^2_{\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}}) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{z}\|^2_{\mathbf{D}^{-1}}\right) \\ = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}}) \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1}}) \quad (41)\end{aligned}$$

with a normalization constant given by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{n_y(N+q)}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^N|\mathbf{D}|}}.$$

Noting that

$$\int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2_{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1}}\right) d\mathbf{Z} = \sqrt{(2\pi)^{n_y q}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z|}$$

it follows that

$$p(\mathbf{Y}|\boldsymbol{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{Nn_y}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^N|\mathbf{D}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1}|}} \times \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}}\right). \quad (42)$$

Because

$$\begin{aligned}|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}|^N|\mathbf{D}||\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1}| = |\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}||\mathbf{D}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1}| = \\ |\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}||\mathbf{I}_{qn_y} + \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^\top(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})\mathbf{G}| = \\ |\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}||\mathbf{I}_{Nn_y} + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}^\top(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})| = |\mathbf{R}|\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$p(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{\Omega}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{Nn_y}|\mathbf{R}|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2_{\mathbf{R}^{-1}}\right),$$

which proves (11). To obtain an expression for $p(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{\Omega}, \mathbf{Y})$ simply insert (41) and (42) into (14) to get

$$p(\mathbf{Z}|\mathbf{\Omega}, \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^{n_y q}|\mathbf{\Sigma}_z|}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\zeta}\|^2_{\mathbf{\Sigma}_z^{-1}}\right),$$

which is (15).

Appendix B
Derivation of the majorizing tangent plane (23)

The first-order Taylor expansion of the log-determinant can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\ln|\mathbf{R}| \simeq \ln|\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}| + (\partial_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \ln|\mathbf{R}|)|_{\mathbf{R}=\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \\ + (\partial_{\mathbf{d}} \ln|\mathbf{R}|_{\mathbf{R}=\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}})(\mathbf{d} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}})\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the vector of diagonal elements in $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ and $\mathbf{d}$ contains the diagonal elements in $\mathbf{D}$.

For the derivatives with respect to $\mathbf{d}$ we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial d_{i,j}} \ln|\mathbf{R}| = \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{R}^{-1}\frac{\partial \mathbf{R}}{\partial d_{i,j}}\right) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\frac{\partial \mathbf{D}}{\partial d_{i,j}}\right).$$

Hence

$$\partial_{\mathbf{d}} \ln|\mathbf{R}|_{\mathbf{R}=\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}}(\mathbf{d} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{G}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{D} - \widetilde{\mathbf{D}})\right).$$

In the same way

$$\partial_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \ln|\mathbf{R}|_{\mathbf{R}=\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes (\mathbf{\Sigma} - \widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}})\right).$$

Since $\ln|\mathbf{R}|$ is concave in $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ and $\mathbf{d}$, it follows that

$$\ln|\mathbf{R}| \leq \widetilde{K} + \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{G}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{D}\right) + \operatorname{tr}\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \mathbf{\Sigma})\right) \quad (43)$$

where

$$\widetilde{K} = \ln|\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}| - \operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{G}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\mathbf{G}\widetilde{\mathbf{D}}\right) - \operatorname{tr}\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}})\right).$$

Appendix C
Proof of Theorem 4

It follows from (22) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{R} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \left(\mathbf{G}^\top(\mathbf{D}_i \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i})\mathbf{G} + \sigma_i(\mathbf{I}_N \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i})\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \left(\mathbf{R}_i \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_i = \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{D}_i \mathbf{\Gamma} + \sigma_i \mathbf{I}_N$. It is then straightforward to show that

$$\mathbf{R}^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \left(\mathbf{R}_i^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i}\right).$$

Hence, we can rewrite (26) as (to within an additive constant):

$$\begin{aligned}V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\mathbf{Z}, \widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \Big(\frac{1}{\sigma_i}\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{z}_i\|^2_{\mathbf{D}_i^{-1}} + \\ \sigma_i \operatorname{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}) + \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{D}_i)\Big). \quad (44)\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i = \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_i$.

We next derive analytical expressions for the $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ and $\mathbf{D}$ that minimize $V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\mathbf{Z}, \widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}})$. Note that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \sigma_i} V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\mathbf{Z}, \widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}) = -\frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i\|_2^2 + \operatorname{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}),$$

and setting the derivative to zero yields the estimate

$$\hat{\sigma}_i = \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i\|_2}{\sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1})}}.$$

Taking the derivative with respect to $d_{i,j}$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial d_{i,j}} V'(\mathbf{\Omega}|\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{\Omega}_n) = -\frac{1}{d_{i,j}^2} z_{i,j}^2 + \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{E}_{j,j}),$$

and noting that

$$\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{\Gamma}\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{E}_{j,j}) = \overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j$$

we get the estimate

$$\hat{d}_{i,j} = \frac{|z_{i,j}|}{\sqrt{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j}}.$$

Inserting these into (44), we see that we can find the minimizing $\mathbf{\Theta}$ and $\mathbf{Z}$ by minimizing

$$\begin{aligned}2\sum_{i=1}^{n_y}\Big(\sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1})}\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_i\|_2 + \\ \sum_{j=1}^{q} |z_{i,j}|\sqrt{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Since term i in the above sum is invariant with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$ and $\mathbf{z}_k$ for $k \neq i$, we can divide term i by $2\sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1})}$, and see that minimizing the criterion above is equivalent to minimizing

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_y} \left(\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_i - \mathbf{\Gamma}^\top \mathbf{z}_i\|_2 + \|\mathbf{w}_i \odot \mathbf{z}_i\|_1\right).$$

Appendix D
Proof of Theorem 5

Initializing (20) at $\overline{\mathbf{\Omega}}_0 = \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{n_y}\}$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}_0 = \{\mathbf{\Theta}_0, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_0\}$ where $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0 = \operatorname{diag}(\sigma_1^{(0)}, \ldots, \sigma_{n_y}^{(0)})$, produces two sequences denoted $\overline{\mathbf{\Omega}}_n = \{\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}_n, \overline{\mathbf{D}}_n, \overline{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n\}$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}_n = \{\mathbf{\Theta}_n, \mathbf{D}_n, \mathbf{\Sigma}_n\}$ for $n > 0$, respectively. This results also in sequences $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n$ and $\mathbf{Z}_n$. The theorem states that:

$$\mathbf{\Theta}_n = \overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Z}_n = \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_n \quad (45)$$

and that

$$\mathbf{D}_n - \overline{\mathbf{D}}_n \to \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{\Sigma}_n - \overline{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_n \to \mathbf{0}. \quad (46)$$

We now show the stronger result that the covariance matrices converge as

$$\mathbf{D}_i^{(n)} = k_i^{(n)}\overline{\mathbf{D}}_i^{(n)}, \quad \sigma_i^{(n)} = k_i^{(n)}\overline{\sigma}_i^{(n)}, \forall n > 0, \quad (47)$$

where $k_i^{(n)} = (\sigma_i^{(0)})^{\frac{1}{2^n}}$. Note that $k_i^{(n)} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence (47) implies (46). We prove (47) and (45) by induction.

That (47) and (45) holds for $n = 1$ follows directly from Theorem 4. Now assume that (47) holds for some $n \geq 1$. Let

$$\overline{\mathbf{R}}_i = \mathbf{\Gamma}\overline{\mathbf{D}}_i^{(n)}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top + \overline{\sigma}_i^{(n)}\mathbf{I}_N,$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i = \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{D}_i^{(n)}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top + \sigma_i^{(n)}\mathbf{I}_N = k_i^{(n)}\overline{\mathbf{R}}_i,$$

where the last equality follows by the assumption in (47). Therefore the weights used to estimate $\mathbf{\Theta}_{n+1}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{n+1}$ are the same as those used to estimate $\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}_{n+1}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{Z}_{n+1}}$:

$$w_{i,j} = \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j}{\mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1})}} = \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top \overline{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j}{\mathrm{tr}(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1})}},$$

so we can conclude that $\mathbf{\Theta}_{n+1} = \overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}_{n+1}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{n+1} = \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{n+1}$. The estimate $\mathbf{D}_{n+1}$ is given by

$$d_{i,j}^{(n+1)} = \frac{|z_{i,j}|}{\sqrt{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}_i^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j}} = \frac{\sqrt{k_i^{(n)}}|z_{i,j}|}{\sqrt{\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^\top \overline{\mathbf{R}}^{-1}\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}}} = k_i^{(n+1)}\overline{d}_{i,j}^{(n+1)}$$

so $\mathbf{D}_i^{(n+1)} = k_i^{(n+1)}\overline{\mathbf{D}}_i^{(n+1)}$, and in the same way it can be seen that $\sigma_i^{(n+1)} = k_i^{(n+1)}\overline{\sigma}_i^{(n+1)}$. Hence by induction (47) and (45) are true for all $n > 0$ and Theorem 5 follows.

Appendix E
Derivation of the proposed recursive algorithm

In order to minimize $V'(\mathbf{Z})$ we use a cyclic algorithm. That is, we minimize with respect to one component at a time. We follow an approach similar to that in [25], with the main difference being that here we consider arbitrary nonnegative weights $\mathbf{w}_i$.

Note that minimization of $V'(\mathbf{Z})$ with respect to $z_{i,j}$ is equivalent to minimizing

$$V'(z_{i,j}) = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{i,j} - \mathbf{c}_j z_{i,j}\|_2 + w_{i,j}|z_{i,j}|$$

where

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{i,j} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_i - \sum_{k\neq j}\mathbf{c}_k z_{i,k}, \quad \mathbf{c}_j = [\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H}]_j.$$

As in [25] it can be shown that the sign of the optimal $\hat{z}_{i,j}$ is given by

$$\mathrm{sign}(\hat{z}_{i,j}) = \mathrm{sign}(\mathbf{c}_j^\top\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{i,j}).$$

Hence we only have to find the absolute value $r_{i,j} = |z_{i,j}|$. Introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{i,j} &= \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{i,j}\|_2^2\\ \beta_j &= \|\mathbf{c}_j\|_2^2\\ g_{i,j} &= \mathbf{c}_j^\top\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{i,j}.\end{aligned}$$

It is then straightforward to verify that the minimization of $V'(z_{i,j})$ is equivalent to minimizing

$$V'(r_{i,j}) = (\alpha_{i,j} + \beta_j r_{i,j}^2 - 2g_{i,j}r_{i,j})^{1/2} + w_{i,j}r_{i,j},$$

over all $r_{i,j} \geq 0$, and then setting $\hat{z}_{i,j} = \mathrm{sign}(g_{i,j})\hat{r}_{i,j}$. Note that it follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality that

$$\alpha_{i,j}\beta_{i,j} \geq g_{i,j}^2.$$

Using this inequality it was shown in [25] that $V'(r_{i,j})$ is a convex function. The derivative of $V'(r_{i,j})$ is given by (dropping the subindices for now),

$$\frac{dV'}{dr} = \frac{\beta r - |g|}{(\beta r^2 - 2|g|r + \alpha)^{1/2}} + w. \tag{48}$$

Since $V'(r)$ is convex it follows that it is minimized by $r = 0$ if and only if $dV'(0)/dr \geq 0$, i.e., if and only if

$$\alpha w^2 \geq g^2. \tag{49}$$

Next we study the case when $g^2 > \alpha w^2$. It then follows from (48) that the stationary points of $V'(r)$ satisfy

$$(\beta r - |g|) = -w(\beta r^2 - 2|g|r + \alpha)^{1/2} \tag{50}$$

Solving this equation for r we get the stationary point

$$\hat{r} = \frac{|g|}{\beta} - \frac{w}{\beta\sqrt{\beta - w^2}}\sqrt{\alpha\beta - g^2}.$$

Hence we can conclude that the minimizer of $V'(z_{i,j})$ is given by

$$\hat{z}_{i,j} = \begin{cases}\mathrm{sign}(g_{i,j})\hat{r}_{i,j} & \text{if } \alpha_{i,j}w_{i,j}^2 < g_{i,j}^2\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}.$$

Next we show how to obtain this estimate using only recursively computed quantities. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{T} &= (\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H})^\top(\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H})\\ \kappa_i &= \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_2^2\\ \rho_i &= \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i - (\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H})\mathbf{z}_i\|_2^2\\ \eta_i &= \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i - (\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H})\mathbf{z}_i\|_2^2\\ \zeta_i &= (\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H})(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i - (\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H})\mathbf{z}_i)\end{aligned}$$

Then it is straightforward to show that

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{i,j} &= \eta_i + \beta_j z_{i,j}^2 + 2\zeta_{i,j}z_{i,j}\\ \beta_j &= \mathbf{T}_{j,j}\\ g_{i,j} &= \zeta_{i,j} + \beta_j z_{i,j}.\end{aligned}$$

Also define $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(t)$ recursively, for any two vector-valued signals $\mathbf{a}(t)$, $\mathbf{b}(t)$, as

$$\mathbf{\Psi}^{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(0) = \mathbf{0} \tag{51}$$

$$\mathbf{\Psi}^{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(t+1) = \mathbf{\Psi}^{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(t) + \mathbf{a}(t)\mathbf{b}^\top(t). \tag{52}$$

Note that $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(t) = (\mathbf{\Psi}^{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{a}}(t))^\top$. Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{T} &= \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top - \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top + \mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{\Phi}\mathbf{\Phi}^\top\mathbf{H}^\top\\ &= \mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(N) - \mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(N)\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(N) + \mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(N)\mathbf{H}.\end{aligned}$$

In the same way it can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_i &= \mathbf{\Psi}_{i,i}^{\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}}(N) + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i^\top\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(N)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i - 2\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i^\top[\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\mathbf{y}}(N)]_i\\ \rho_i &= [\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\mathbf{y}}(N)]_i - \mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(N)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i\\ &\quad - \mathbf{H}[\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\mathbf{y}}(N)]_i + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(N)\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i\\ \eta_i &= \kappa_i - 2\rho_i^\top\mathbf{z}_i + \mathbf{z}_i^\top\mathbf{T}\mathbf{z}_i\\ \zeta_i &= \rho_i - \mathbf{T}\mathbf{z}_i.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, all the variables we need to find $\hat{z}_{i,j}$ can be computed using $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\cdot,\cdot}(N)$, and the latter matrices can be computed

recursively. Note that in the above derivation we did not make any assumptions on $\mathbf{w}_i$, so these weights can either be precomputed, or possibly computed recursively. We can see that for the case with $\widetilde{\mathbf{\Omega}}_0 = \{\widetilde{\mathbf{\Theta}}_0, \mathbf{0}, \widetilde{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_0\}$, the weights are given by

$$w_{i,j}^2 = \frac{1}{N}\|\overline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{N}\left(\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{\Gamma}^\top\right)_{j,j} = \frac{1}{N}\mathbf{\Psi}_{j,j}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(N).$$

The full algorithm for updating the needed quantities, including the update of $\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}$ and $\mathbf{H}$, is summarized in Algorithm 1. Note that the iterations of the outer for-loop can be executed in parallel.

Algorithm 1 : **Recursive solution to** (27)

Input: $\mathbf{y}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}(t)$, $\check{\mathbf{\Theta}}$ and $\check{\mathbf{Z}}$
Update $\mathbf{P}(t)$, $\overline{\mathbf{\Theta}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{H}(t)$ according to (33)-(35).
Update $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}(t)$, $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(t)$, $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}}(t)$, $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(t)$, $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\mathbf{y}}(t)$ and $\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\mathbf{y}}(t)$ according to (52) .
$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\gamma}} + \mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\mathbf{H}$.
for $i = 1, \ldots, n_y$ **do**
    $\kappa = \mathbf{\Psi}_{i,i}^{\mathbf{y},\mathbf{y}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i^\top\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i - 2\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i^\top[\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\mathbf{y}}]_i$.
    $\rho = [\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\mathbf{y}}]_i - \mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i - \mathbf{H}^\top[\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\gamma}}]_i + \mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{\Psi}^{\boldsymbol{\varphi},\boldsymbol{\varphi}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_i$.
    $\eta = \kappa - 2\rho^\top\check{\mathbf{z}}_i + \check{\mathbf{z}}_i^\top\mathbf{T}\check{\mathbf{z}}_i$.
    $\zeta = \rho - \mathbf{T}\check{\mathbf{z}}_i$
    repeat
        for $j = 1, \ldots, q$ **do**
            $\alpha = \eta + \mathbf{T}_{j,j}\check{z}_{i,j}^2 + 2\zeta_j\check{z}_{i,j}$.
            $g = \zeta_j + \mathbf{T}_{j,j}\check{z}_{i,j}$.
            $\beta = \mathbf{T}_{j,j}$.
            $\hat{r} = \frac{|g|}{\beta} - \frac{w_{i,j}}{\beta\sqrt{\beta - w_{i,j}^2}}\sqrt{\alpha\beta - g^2}$.
            $\hat{z}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(g)\hat{r} & \text{if } \alpha w_{i,j}^2 < g^2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
            $\eta := \eta + \mathbf{T}_{j,j}(\check{z}_{i,j} - \hat{z}_{i,j}) + 2(\check{z}_{i,j} - \hat{z}_{i,j})\zeta_j$.
            $\zeta := \zeta + [\mathbf{T}]_j(\check{z}_{i,j} - \hat{z}_{i,j})$.
            $\check{z}_{i,j} := \hat{z}_{i,j}$.
        end for
    until number of iterations equals L.
end for
$\widehat{\mathbf{Z}} = \check{\mathbf{Z}}$.
$\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}} = \overline{\mathbf{\Theta}} - \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{H}$.
Output: $\widehat{\mathbf{\Theta}}, \widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Söderström and P. Stoica, *System identification*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1988.
[2] L. Ljung, *System Identification: Theory for the User*. Pearson Education, 1998.
[3] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer, 2006.
[4] D. Barber, *Bayesian reasoning and machine learning*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
[5] G. E. Box, G. M. Jenkins, G. C. Reinsel, and G. M. Ljung, *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
[6] M. Enqvist, *Linear models of nonlinear systems*. PhD thesis, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden, 2005.
[7] F. Giri and E.-W. Bai, *Block-oriented nonlinear system identification*, vol. 1. Springer, 2010.
[8] J. Sjöberg, Q. Zhang, L. Ljung, A. Benveniste, B. Delyon, P.-Y. Glorennec, H. Hjalmarsson, and A. Juditsky, "Nonlinear black-box modeling in system identification: a unified overview," *Automatica*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 1691 – 1724, 1995.
[9] L. Ljung and T. Söderström, *Theory and Practice of Recursive Identification*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.
[10] H. Chen, "Extended recursive least squares algorithm for nonlinear stochastic systems," in *American Control Conference, 2004. Proceedings of the 2004*, vol. 5, pp. 4758–4763, IEEE, 2004.
[11] T. Wigren, "Recursive prediction error identification using the nonlinear Wiener model," *Automatica*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 1011 – 1025, 1993.
[12] P. Mattsson and T. Wigren, "Convergence analysis for recursive Hammerstein identification," *Automatica*, vol. 71, pp. 179–186, 2016.
[13] S. Tayamon, T. Wigren, and J. Schoukens, "Convergence analysis and experiments using an RPEM based on nonlinear ODEs and midpoint integration," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2012 IEEE 51st Annual Conference on*, pp. 2858–2865, IEEE, 2012.
[14] J. Roll, A. Nazin, and L. Ljung, "Nonlinear system identification via direct weight optimization," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 475–490, 2005.
[15] E.-W. Bai and Y. Liu, "Recursive direct weight optimization in nonlinear system identification: A minimal probability approach," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 1218–1231, 2007.
[16] H. Bijl, J.-W. van Wingerden, T. B. Schön, and M. Verhaegen, "Online sparse gaussian process regression using fitc and pitc approximations," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 48, no. 28, pp. 703–708, 2015.
[17] J. Paduart, L. Lauwers, J. Swevers, K. Smolders, J. Schoukens, and R. Pintelon, "Identification of nonlinear systems using polynomial nonlinear state space models," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 647 – 656, 2010.
[18] L. Ljung, "Model validation and model error modeling," in *The Åström Symposium on Control*, pp. 15–42, Studentlitteratur, 1999.
[19] A. Solin and S. Särkkä, "Hilbert space methods for reduced-rank Gaussian process regression," 2014. arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.5508.
[20] P. Van den Hof and B. Ninness, "System identification with generalized orthonormal basis functions," in *Modelling and Identification with Rational Orthogonal Basis Functions*, pp. 61–102, Springer, 2005.
[21] T. T. Wu, K. Lange, *et al.*, "The mm alternative to em," *Statistical Science*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 492–505, 2010.
[22] A. Belloni, V. Chernozhukov, and L. Wang, "Square-root lasso: pivotal recovery of sparse signals via conic programming," *Biometrika*, vol. 98, no. 4, pp. 791–806, 2011.
[23] P. Stoica, D. Zachariah, and J. Li, "Weighted SPICE: A unifying approach for hyperparameter-free sparse estimation," *Digital Signal Processing*, vol. 33, pp. 1–12, 2014.
[24] P. Stoica and P. Åhgren, "Exact initialization of the recursive least-squares algorithm," *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 219–230, 2002.
[25] D. Zachariah and P. Stoica, "Online hyperparameter-free sparse estimation method," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 63, pp. 3348–3359, July 2015.
[26] L. Ljung, *System identification toolbox for use with MATLAB*. The MathWorks, Inc., 2007.
[27] T. Wigren, "Recursive prediction error identification and scaling of nonlinear state space models using a restricted black box parameterization," *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 159 – 168, 2006.
[28] A. L. Juloski, W. Heemels, and G. Ferrari-Trecate, "Data-based hybrid modelling of the component placement process in pick-and-place machines," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 1241–1252, 2004.
[29] A. Bemporad, A. Garulli, S. Paoletti, and A. Vicino, "A bounded-error approach to piecewise affine system identification," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 50, pp. 1567–1580, Oct 2005.
[30] A. Juloski, S. Paoletti, and J. Roll, "Recent techniques for the identification of piecewise affine and hybrid systems," in *Current Trends in Nonlinear Systems and Control* (L. Menini, L. Zaccarian, and C. Abdallah, eds.), pp. 79–99, Birkhäuser Boston, 2006.
[31] H. Ohlsson and L. Ljung, "Identification of switched linear regression models using sum-of-norms regularization," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 1045–1050, 2013.